

Before the
Federal Communications Commission
Washington, D.C. 20554

In the matter of)	
)	
PanAmSat Corporation)	Fee Control No. 9810308210288001
Application for PAS-8B Satellite)	
)	
)	
Request for Waiver and Refund of)	
Filing Fees for the PAS-8B Satellite)	
)	

Memorandum Opinion and Order

Adopted: September 1, 2004

Released: September 9, 2004

By the Commission:

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The Commission has before it an Application for Review filed by PanAmSat Corporation (PanAmSat) on February 6, 2002. PanAmSat seeks review of a decision of the Office of Managing Director denying its petition for reconsideration.¹ PanAmSat had requested reconsideration of the Managing Director's letter ruling denying a waiver and refund of the filing fees associated with an application to launch and operate the PAS-8B replacement satellite.² For the reasons set forth below, we affirm OMD's action but find that additional information presented in PanAmSat's Application for Review provides a basis to grant the partial fee relief PanAmSat seeks.

II. BACKGROUND

2. PanAmSat applied for and received authorization to launch and operate a Ku-band fixed-service satellite PAS-8B to replace PanAmSat's PAS-8 satellite. The PAS-8B satellite, launched on December 21, 1998 pursuant to special temporary authorization, commenced service in February 1999. At

¹ Letter from Mark Reger, Chief Financial Officer, Office of Managing Director, Federal Communications Commission, to Joseph A. Godles, Esquire, Request for Waiver and Refund of Filing Fees, PanAmSat Corporation Application for PAS-8B Satellite, Fee Control No. 9810308210288001 (dated January 7, 2002) (*January 7 Letter Decision*).

² Letter from Mark A. Reger, Chief Financial Officer, Office of Managing Director, Federal Communications Commission, to Joseph A. Godles, Esquire, Request for Waiver and Refund of Filing Fees, PanAmSat Corporation Application for PAS-8B Satellite, Fee Control No. 9810308210288001 (dated August 1, 2000) (*August 1 Letter Decision*).

that time PanAmSat removed the PAS-8 satellite from service and turned off its communications payload. PanAmSat's application for the PAS-8B satellite represented that replacement was necessary because its PAS-8 satellite, launched in late 1997, lacked full payload capacity due to losses to its power generating system. The attached request sought waiver and refund of the \$89,460 application fee paid in connection with its application to construct, launch, and operate a replacement satellite technically comparable to the previously authorized satellite.³ PanAmSat claimed that "the fees contained in the fee schedule bear scant relationship to the resources required to process the replacement satellite's application," and that the Managing Director has granted partial refunds in similar circumstances in which minimal regulatory review is required to authorize replacement satellites.⁴

3. OMD denied PanAmSat's waiver request as well as its petition for reconsideration of that letter ruling. OMD concluded that PanAmSat had not demonstrated good cause for the waiver or shown that a waiver would promote the public interest, as is required by Section 8 of the Communications Act, 47 U.S.C. § 158, and Section 1.1117(a) of the Commission's Rules, 47 C.F.R. § 1.1117. Specifically, as OMD pointed out, PanAmSat had indicated only that PAS-8B would "replace the PAS-8 satellite ... [that] lacks full payload capacity" without explaining the extent to which unspecified losses in its power generating system reduced the satellite's useful life or otherwise demonstrating extraordinary and compelling circumstances. In the absence of a showing that the PAS-8 satellite had suffered a catastrophic in-orbit failure or would not be available to provide further service, OMD concluded that PanAmSat had not met its burden of demonstrating good cause for a waiver. In so concluding, OMD relied on the then applicable space station cut-off rule, 47 C.F.R. § 25.113(g), under which an application to launch an on-ground spare satellite is considered newly filed unless "determined to be an emergency replacement ... that has been lost as a result of a launch failure or catastrophic in-orbit failure." OMD also distinguished earlier fee decisions granting partial relief of fees associated with applications to replace satellites destroyed during launch, including one involving PanAmSat's Galaxy X-R satellite.⁵ Finally, OMD rejected PanAmSat's further argument that relief is warranted because the assessed fee does not reflect the actual effort expended by the Commission on a particular application or type of application.

4. In its Application for Review, PanAmSat maintains that relief is warranted under a policy that originated in *Hughes Communications Galaxy, Inc.*, 9 FCC Rcd 2230 (OMD 1994), of assessing the modification fee instead of the replacement fee in connection with an application to construct, launch, and operate a space station that is technically comparable to one that failed prematurely, and that OMD granted such relief in at least one case, *AT&T Corporation*, 10 FCC Rcd 8924, 8928-29 (OMD 1995), involving a post-launch failure. Relief in those cases, PanAmSat contends, was not predicated on a showing that the

³ The PAS-8B satellite has the same technical characteristics, covers the same areas of Latin America, uses the same frequency bands, and operates at the same EIRPs as PAS-8.

⁴ Request for Waiver and Refund of Filing Fees, at 2 & nn.3-4, citing *Fee Decisions of the Managing Director*, 9 FCC Rcd 2223, 2230-31 (1994) (*Hughes Communications Galaxy*); Letter of Marilyn McDermott, FCC Associate Managing Director to Joseph A. Godles, Attorney for PanAmSat (Feb. 24, 1997).

⁵ *Hughes Communications Galaxy*, 9 FCC Rcd 2223, 2230-2231 (OMD 1994) (granting partial fee relief in connection with application to replace satellite where the original satellite was destroyed during launch); Letter from Mark A. Reger, Chief Financial Officer, Office of Managing Director, Federal Communications Commission, to Joseph A. Godles, Esquire, Counsel for PanAmSat, Request for Waiver and Refund of Filing Fees (Fee Control # 99051982103300), dated June 16, 2000 (granting partial fee relief in connection with an application to replace the Galaxy X satellite, which had suffered a launch failure) (*PanAmSat Galaxy X Letter*).

original satellite suffered a "catastrophic in-orbit failure" or that the replacement event demonstrates "extraordinary and compelling circumstances" and, in any event, it claims the failure of the PAS-8 was every bit as catastrophic and the circumstances just as compelling and extraordinary as in any case in which OMD has granted relief. PanAmSat points specifically to extensive circuitry failures occurring soon after launch that, although not the result of an explosion, had a devastating impact on the service PAS-8 could provide.

III. DISCUSSION

5. We conclude that the Managing Director properly denied PanAmSat's waiver request but that, in the circumstances of this case, we will consider additional information presented in the Application for Review and afford partial fee relief. To begin with, we affirm OMD's principal conclusion that PanAmSat must show that its PAS-8 satellite failed prematurely under compelling and extraordinary circumstances in order to demonstrate the requisite good cause for a fee waiver under Section 158(d). We also consider for the first time OMD's policy initiated in *Hughes* of assessing the fee for modification of a space station (instead of the full fee for a replacement satellite) in certain circumstances where a replacement satellite is technically comparable to the satellite it replaces. In addition, we clarify that, consistent with congressional intent and established precedent, application fees are not adjusted to reflect the actual work done on any particular application – including one to authorize a replacement satellite. Once extraordinary and compelling circumstances resulting in the satellite's premature failure are shown, however, as is the case here, we believe it is appropriate to assess the lower modification fee.

6. The Commission is statutorily required to assess and collect application fees in accordance with the Schedule of Fees prescribed by Congress.⁶ 47 U.S.C. § 158; 47 C.F.R. § 1.1102-1.1107. *See also Establishment of a Fee Collection Program to Implement the Provisions of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1989*, 5 FCC Rcd 3558, 3574 ¶ 36 (1990), *citing* Conference Report at 433. Such fees represent a fair approximation by Congress as to how the Commission's costs should be distributed and may be waived or deferred only "for good cause shown, where such action will promote the public interest." 47 U.S.C. § 158(d)(2); 47 C.F.R. § 1.1117(a). *See also Establishment of a Fee Collection Program to Implement the Provisions of the Consolidated Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (Section 8 Fees Report and Order)*, 2 FCC Rcd 947 (1987). The Commission narrowly interprets its waiver authority to require that "those requesting a waiver or deferral will have the burden of demonstrating that, for each request, a waiver or deferral would override the public interest, as determined by Congress, that the government should be reimbursed for that specific regulatory action of the FCC," *id.* at 961 ¶¶ 87-88, and interprets good cause to require a showing of compelling and extraordinary circumstances. *Sirius Satellite Radio, Inc.*, 18 FCC Rcd 12551, 12554 ¶ 11 (2003), *citing Section 8 Fees Report and Order*, 2 FCC Rcd at 958 ¶ 70.

7. Under the Schedule of Fees prescribed by Congress, the application fee is the same for an initial and for a replacement space station, but a significantly lower fee is prescribed under the separate fee category for modification of a space station. 47 U.S.C. §§ 158(g)(16)(b)(i), (b)(ii), (d) (Common Carrier

⁶ The Commission may only adjust the Fee Schedule every two years to reflect changes in the Consumer Price Index. *See* 47 U.S.C. § 158(b)(1).

Services); 47 C.F.R. §§ 1.1107(9)(a)(i), (a)(ii), (c).⁷ Relying on a series of fee letters that began with *Hughes*, PanAmSat seeks to be assessed the lower modification fee because, it argues, this more accurately reflects the processing cost to the Commission entailed in authorizing a replacement satellite in these circumstances. It is well established, however, that “there is ‘no justification in the statute or legislative history for apportioning fees in accordance with the actual work done on any particular application.’”⁸ The Commission, as OMD noted, carefully considered but rejected the argument that prescribed fees should reflect actual costs when it implemented its responsibility to assess and collect application fees. *January 7 Letter Decision*, citing *Establishment of a Fee Collection Program To Implement the Provisions of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (Memorandum Opinion and Order)*, 3 FCC Rcd 5987 ¶ 5 (1988) (recognizing that “the amount of a fee represents the Commission’s estimate, accepted by Congress, of the average cost to the Commission;” declining to “make individualized determinations of the ‘appropriate fee,’” although the actual cost may be more or less in individual situations; and indicating an intent to “levy the fee as determined by Congress ... except in unusual cases in which the public interest requires otherwise.”).

8. We agree with OMD that PanAmSat did not make the requisite showings for a fee waiver. In support of its waiver request, as is noted in the OMD *January 7 Letter Decision*, PanAmSat represented only that the PAS-8B satellite will “replace the PAS-8 satellite... [that] lacks full payload capacity due to losses in its power generating system.” Having provided no information to explain the cause or ultimate impact of these losses on PAS-8’s useful life, however, PanAmSat clearly failed to meet its “burden of demonstrating that, for each request, a waiver or deferral would override the public interest, as determined by Congress, that the government should be reimbursed for that specific regulatory action of the FCC.”⁹ *Section 8 Fees Report and Order*, 2 FCC Rcd at 961 ¶ 88. Without such information, there was no basis to determine that PAS-8 had failed prematurely under extraordinary and compelling circumstances analogous to the in-orbit failures or failure at or soon after launch deemed sufficient to warrant partial fee waivers in the *Hughes*, *PanAmSat (Galaxy X-R)*, and *AT&T* cases, and OMD properly denied PanAmSat’s waiver request on that basis. Insofar as language in the cited OMD rulings suggests that fee relief may properly be based on any reduced processing burdens associated with authorizing a technically comparable replacement satellite, we clarify that, consistent with congressional intent and established agency precedent, good cause for fee waiver or deferral requires a showing of compelling and extraordinary circumstances.¹⁰ *See Vernal*

⁷ The fees at issue here are \$89,460 for an initial or replacement space station authorization and \$5740 for modification of a space station authorization. *Amendment of the Schedule of Application Fees Set Forth in Sections 1.1102 Through 1.1107 of the Commission’s Rules*, 13 FCC Rcd 13614 (1998).

⁸ *Lockheed Martin Corp.* 16 FCC Rcd 12805, 12807 ¶ 5 (2001). *See also Establishment of a Fee Collection Program to Implement the Provisions of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (Section 8 Fees Report and Order)*, 2 FCC Rcd 947, 949 (1987) (stating that “processing costs were but one factor in the rough calculus that resulted in the legislated fees”).

⁹ There is no merit to PanAmSat’s suggestion that this burden applies only to requests to defer legislated fees, not to requests to waive such fees. Section 158(d)(2) of the Act expressly governs waivers, as well as deferrals, as does the implementing rule, Section 1.1117(a) and the quoted language from the Commission’s Report and Order implementing its obligations to collect and assess application fees.

¹⁰ *Sirius Satellite Radio, Inc.*, 18 FCC Rcd at 12554 ¶ 11; *Section 8 Fees Report and Order*, 2 FCC Rcd at 958 ¶ 70 (Commission interprets its statutory authority under Section 158(d)(2) as allowing the grant of waivers or deferrals to specific applicants upon a showing of compelling and extraordinary circumstances); *Revisions to Broadcast Auxiliary Service Rules in Part 74 and Conforming Technical Rules for Broadcast Auxiliary Service, Cable Television Relay Service and Fixed Services In Parts 74, 78 and 101 of the Commission’s Rules*, 18 FCC Rcd 21134, 21140 ¶ 15 (OET 2003) (Individualized fee (continued...))

Enterprises, Inc. v. FCC, 355 F.3d 650, 660 (D.C. Cir. 2004) (the Commission is not required to adhere to an OMD fee refund policy that it never endorsed).

9. We find, however, that additional information provided in PanAmSat's application for review is sufficient to establish that the satellite failed prematurely in compelling and extraordinary circumstances and that assessing the lower modification fee promotes the public interest.¹¹ In particular, PanAmSat reports that reduced payload capacity caused by extensive electrical failures detected within five days of launch significantly impacted existing service being provided by PAS-8. Ensuring continuous service to the public thus necessitated that PanAmSat replace the satellite less than two years after launch at a cost of more than \$200 million, of which less than \$30 million was covered by insurance. We agree with PanAmSat that for fee purposes it is not dispositive that the events requiring that PAS-8 be replaced stemmed from failures occurring soon after launch, rather than during launch or as a result of an in-orbit catastrophe, as was the case in other situations in which OMD assessed the space station modification fee. In this regard, we note the general presumption that "applicants applying for, and submitting the filing fee for, replacement or expansion satellites are operating their in-orbit satellites at full capacity,"¹² and that, even for purposes of the cut-off rule cited by OMD,¹³ catastrophic failures were never restricted to those

(...continued from previous page)

waiver request must demonstrate compelling and extraordinary circumstances in addition to the good cause and public interest showings and other criteria specified in Section 1.1117).

¹¹ In relying on factual information that OMD did not have an opportunity to consider, we note that Section 1.115(c) provides that "[n]o application for review will be granted if it relies on questions of fact or law upon which the designated authority has been afforded no opportunity to pass." The accompanying Note specifies that, "[s]ubject to the requirements of Section 1.106, new questions of fact or law may be presented to the designated authority in a petition for reconsideration." However, we find good cause for a waiver in the circumstances of this case. In particular, it is clear from PanAmSat's application for review that it was only after OMD's *January 7 Letter Decision* that PanAmSat appreciated the potential relevance of the circumstances surrounding the failure of the PAS-8 satellite to obtaining a fee waiver where the replacement satellite is technically comparable to the failed satellite. Given that language in earlier OMD fee waiver rulings was not entirely clear on the nature of the showing required, we do not believe that dismissing PanAmSat's application for review on procedural grounds would serve the public interest. See *Lunenburg County Public Schools Victoria, Virginia*, 17 FCC Rcd 24179, 24184 ¶ 8 (2001) (finding good cause to waive section 1.115(c) where the applicant could not have reasonably known the significance of addressing the issue at the time of the designated authority's decision); *Mercury PCS II*, 15 FCC Rcd 9654, 9660 n.52 and cases cited therein (public interest is a basis to waive Section 1.115(c)).

¹² See *Streamlining the Commission's Rules and Regulations for Satellite Application and Licensing Procedures*, 10 FCC Rcd 10624, 10626 ¶ 10 (1995) (proposing to eliminate as unnecessary the requirement that applicants supply detailed information as to the historical use of their satellite when requesting a replacement satellite).

¹³ Pursuant to 47 C.F.R. 25.113(g), in effect at the time of the *January 7 Decision Letter*, "an application for authority to launch and operate an on-ground spare satellite will be considered to be a newly-filed application for cut-off purposes, except where the space station to be launched is determined to be an emergency replacement for a previously authorized space station that has been lost as a result of a launch failure or a catastrophic in-orbit failure." The Commission since amended section 25.113(g) to change the processing of on-ground spare satellites, but subparagraph (g)(3) retains an exception for those applications "determined to be an emergency replacement for a previously authorized space station that was lost as a result of a launch failure or a catastrophic in-orbit failure." *Amendment of the Commission's Space Station Rules and Policies*, 18 FCC Rcd 12764 (2003).

occurring within the first year after launch.¹⁴ What happened here was clearly not the end-of-life event in which a satellite is operating at full or near full payload capacity but with outmoded facilities in need of upgrading for which a replacement fee equivalent to that collected for initial authorization of the satellite was intended. Rather, extensive power failures, manifested soon after launch, severely reduced the satellite's payload capacity and jeopardized existing service, meaning that its costly and premature replacement was required to ensure continuity of service to PanAmSat's customers. Under these circumstances, and because no new orbital assignment was requested, the International Bureau granted the replacement application for the PAS-8B satellite outside of a processing round.¹⁵ In these compelling and extraordinary circumstances, we likewise find good cause that overrides the public interest in the Commission's recovering the full costs apportioned to processing authorizations for replacement space stations, and that a waiver will promote the public interest. Instead of the full space station replacement fee, PanAmSat should therefore be assessed the space station modification fee. It is therefore entitled to a refund in the amount of \$83,720, representing the difference between the space station replacement fee already paid and the space station modification fee.

10. ACCORDINGLY, IT IS ORDERED, That the application for review filed on February 6, 2002 by PanAmSat IS GRANTED in part; and that the Managing Director IS DIRECTED to issue a refund to PanAmSat as described above.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Marlene H. Dortch
Secretary

¹⁴ *Amendment of Part 25 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations to Reduce Alien Carrier Interference Between Fixed Satellites At Reduced Orbital Spacings and To Revise Application Processing Procedures For Satellite Communications Services*, 6 FCC Rcd 2806, 2812 ¶ 40 (1991) (deleting the proposed requirement that catastrophic failures must occur within the first year of operation but making clear that the rule does not cover the replacement of outmoded facilities near the end of the satellite's useful life).

¹⁵ *PanAmSat Licensing Corp.*, 14 FCC Rcd 7725, 7727 (IB 1999).

Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554

: 22

FILE COPY

Fee Control No. 9810308210288001

RECEIVED

FEB - 6 2002

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

APPLICATION FOR REVIEW

PanAmsat Corporation ("PanAmsat") has requested that the Commission waive and refund the filing fee associated with its application for authority to launch and operate the PAS-8B replacement satellite. The Office of the Managing Director ("OMD") denied PanAmsat's request, and PanAmsat sought reconsideration of the denial. On January 7, 2002, OMD issued a decision (the "Reconsideration Decision") denying PanAmsat's request for reconsideration.¹ PanAmsat, by its attorneys and pursuant to Section 1.115 of the Commission's rules,² hereby files this Application for Review of the Reconsideration Decision.

DISCUSSION

A. Background

On October 29, 1998, PanAmsat filed an application to launch and operate a satellite -- known as PAS-8B -- to replace PAS-8, which had suffered prematurely an in-orbit failure of its power generating system. PanAmsat also requested special temporary authority ("STA"), on an emergency basis, to launch and operate PAS-8B

¹ Letter from Mark Reger, OMD Chief Financial Officer, to Joseph A. Godles, Esquire, Counsel to PanAmsat, Re: Petition for Reconsideration In re Request for Waiver and Refund of Filing Fees, PanAmsat Corporation Application for PAS-8B Satellite, Fee Control No. 9810308210288001, January 7, 2002 ("Reconsideration Decision").
² 47 C.F.R. § 1.115. See also 47 C.F.R. § 1.117(c) (regarding the Managing Director's role in acting on fee-related decisions).

REC'D
FEB 26 2004

while its application was pending. PAS-8B was launched on December 21, 1998, pursuant to an STA, and commenced service in February of 1999. PanAmSat removed PAS-8 from service at that time, and since then the communications payload of PAS-8 has been turned off.

The Commission granted the replacement application for PAS-8B on May 18, 1999.³ Along with that application, PanAmSat had filed a request for a fee waiver and refund of the application-filing fee (the "Request").⁴ PanAmSat based its Request on fee waivers the Commission had granted in comparable circumstances. In those cases, which involved launch failures rather than in-orbit failures, the Commission had assessed a space station modification fee, rather than a full new space station fee, for the replacement application.

OMD denied PanAmSat's initial fee-related request as well as a subsequent petition for reconsideration.⁵ According to the Reconsideration Decision, PanAmSat had not demonstrated "good cause" for a waiver or shown that a waiver "would promote the public interest."⁶ To satisfy these standards, OMD found, PanAmSat would have to show that PAS-8 suffered a "catastrophic in-orbit failure" or demonstrate other "extraordinary and compelling circumstances." OMD also relied on the fact that the satellite failure involved in another waiver proceeding had occurred "during launch" rather than in-orbit.

The Reconsideration Decision is inconsistent with Commission precedent. It imposes new requirements going beyond what was required previously in connection

³ *Order and Authorization*, DA 99-948.

⁴ Request for Waiver and Refund of Fees, Fee Control No. 9810308210288001, Oct. 29, 1998 (the "Request").

⁵ See Letter from Mark Reger, OMD Chief Financial Officer, to Joseph A. Godles, Esquire, Counsel to PanAmSat, Request for Waiver and Refund of Filing Fees, PanAmSat Corporation Application for PAS-8B Satellite, Fee Control No. 9810308210288001, August 1, 2000 ("Waiver decision"). PanAmSat petitioned for reconsideration of this decision on August 31, 2001, which OMD denied on January 7, 2002. See also Reconsideration Decision.

⁶ Reconsideration Decision at 1.

with fee waivers for replacement satellites, and those additional requirements bear no relationship to the policy underlying the prior waivers. The principal source offered for these additional requirements is an FCC rule pertaining to cut-off procedures, not filing fees. PanAmSat's fee waiver request fits squarely within the standards that the Commission articulated previously for replacement satellite fee waivers, and it should be irrelevant for fee waiver purposes whether a satellite fails on the launch pad, during launch, or prematurely in orbit. Indeed, the Commission already has granted a fee waiver based on a post-launch failure.⁷ Accordingly, and for the reasons stated herein, on review PanAmSat's waiver request should be granted.

B. FCC Precedent Supports PanAmSat's Request for Fee Relief.

Commission policy has been to grant a waiver and refund of fees paid where a satellite has had a premature failure and an applicant requests a replacement satellite that is technically comparable. That policy originated with a fee waiver request filed by Hughes Communications Galaxy, Inc. ("Hughes"), which needed to launch a replacement satellite after one of its satellites had to be destroyed during launch because of a malfunction.⁸ As Hughes noted in its request, when a replacement satellite is technically identical to its predecessor, the only Commission action required is approval of a new milestone date for launch.⁹

OMD has found that in such cases the satellite application filing fee, bears "scant relationship to [the Commission] resources required to process [a] replacement satellite" application.¹⁰ Rather, OMD has concluded, the "processing burden" associated with such a replacement satellite application is consistent with that of an

⁷ *Fee Decisions of the Managing Director*, 10 FCC Rcd 8924, 8928-29 (1995) (fee waiver granted for replacement of AT&T satellite lost "shortly after launch").

⁸ *Fee Decisions of the Managing Director*, 9 FCC Rcd at 2230 (1994).

⁹ *Id.*

¹⁰ *Id.* at 2231.

application to modify a space station.¹¹ As a result, OMD assesses only the space station modification fee for such replacement satellite applications, waiving the remainder of the fee. This has been true both for PanAmSat and other satellite operators.¹²

PanAmSat fits squarely within the four corners of these precedents. PanAmSat's satellite failed. PanAmSat filed an application to replace the satellite, and sought temporary authority on an emergency basis to launch and operate the satellite. The replacement satellite was technically identical to the satellite that failed, and the Commission only needed to do limited work to issue a new license that was identical to the license that preceded it. As was true of previous fee waivers involving replacement satellites, the Commission's processing burden was closer to that for a modification application than to that for a new space station.

C. The Failure of PAS-8B is Indistinguishable From Prior Failures on Which Fee Waivers Were Based.

The Reconsideration Decision attempted to distinguish PanAmSat's circumstances from those in earlier decisions on two grounds. Neither ground, however, warrants a different outcome.

First, it was claimed that PanAmSat needed to show that it had suffered a "catastrophic in-orbit failure." None of the previous cases, however, suggested that a catastrophe is a pre-condition to a waiver, and the rule cited in support of that claim, 47 C.F.R. § 25.113(g), establishes when an application will be deemed newly filed for cut-off purposes, not fee purposes. Moreover, the principle underlying the replacement satellite precedents - that minimal processing is involved when one satellite fails and is

¹¹ Letter from Mark Reger to Joseph A. Godles (June 16, 2000).

¹² See, e.g., *Fee Decisions of the Managing Director*, 9 FCC Rcd at 2230-31 (granting Hughes Communications Galaxy partial waiver of the filing fee for a replacement satellite); *Fee Decisions of the Managing Director*, 10 FCC Rcd 8924, 8928-29 (1995) (granting AT&T Corp. partial waiver of the filing fee for a replacement satellite); Letter from Marilyn J. McDermott, FCC Associate Managing Director, to Joseph A. Godles (Feb. 24, 1997) (granting PanAmSat partial waiver of the filing fee for its PAS-2R replacement satellite); Letter from Mark Reger to Joseph A. Godles (June

replaced by a technically identical satellite - is unrelated to whether the satellite failure is a catastrophe. PanAmSat, therefore, should not have been required to demonstrate that its failure was catastrophic.

In any event, the failure of PAS-8 was every bit as catastrophic as the failures that prompted OMD to grant fee waivers in previous cases. Power system failures may not be as dramatic as an explosion, but they are equally devastating to service. Even if a showing of catastrophic failure were necessary, therefore, PanAmSat made the showing.

Second, it was claimed in the Reconsideration Decision that PanAmSat had not demonstrated there were "extraordinary and compelling circumstances" supporting a waiver. Just as the Commission had never stated that a showing of a catastrophe would be a pre-condition to a fee waiver for a replacement satellite, however, it had never articulated an extraordinary and compelling circumstance requirement for such waivers. The decision passage cited in the Reconsideration Decision in support of that requirement¹³ relates to fee deferrals, not fee waivers, and the standard for waivers set forth in the rules is "good cause" and the "public interest."¹⁴ PanAmSat, therefore, should not have been required to demonstrate that its satellite failure involved "extraordinary and compelling circumstances."

Even if such a requirement were applicable, PanAmSat satisfies it. PanAmSat's circumstances are as extraordinary and compelling as those associated with prior failures. PAS-8 suffered extensive failures in its power generating system. These failures manifested themselves almost immediately; circuit failures were detected within five days of launch. Over half the circuits on the satellite failed, jeopardizing existing services. PanAmSat was forced to spend in excess of \$200 million to construct

16, 2000) (granting PanAmSat partial waiver of the filing fee for its Galaxy X-R replacement satellite).

¹³ *Establishment of a Fee Collection Program*, 2 FCC Red 947, 954 ¶ 40 (1987).

¹⁴ 47 C.F.R. §§ 1.3, 1.1117(a).

and launch a replacement satellite, less than \$30 million of which was recoverable from its insurers. PanAmSat filed an emergency request for special temporary authority, which the Commission granted, to launch the replacement satellite on an expedited basis. Once the replacement was in place, PanAmSat shut off the communications payload on PAS-8, and has not used it since. It is difficult to imagine more extraordinary or compelling circumstances and, consistent with past precedent, these circumstances warranted a fee waiver.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, and for the reasons set forth above, the Letter and Reconsideration Decisions should be rescinded, and PanAmSat's request for a fee waiver and partial refund should be granted.

Respectfully submitted,

PANAMSAT CORPORATION

/s/ Joseph A. Godles

Joseph A. Godles

Michael A. McCoin

GOLDBERG, GODLES, WIENER & WRIGHT
1229 19th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 429-4900
Its Attorneys

February 6, 2002

[FCC Home](#) | [Search](#) | [Updates](#) | [E-Filing](#) | [Initiatives](#) | [For Consumers](#) | [Find People](#)

Historical Collections System

Historical Collections System

[Help](#)[Log Out](#) (Log Out)[Update Password](#)

Historical Collections System - Washington Collections Data

[Return to Historical Collections Home](#) [Return to Washington Collections Search](#)

☐ Washington Collections Data

Fee Control Number	Payer Name	Payment Amount	Overage Amount	Remittance ID	Payment Type	Date Received	CD Number	Elect. Audit Code
5810308210288001	PANAMSAT LICENSEE CORPORATION	\$89,460.00	\$0.00	012286	CHECK	10/29/1998	347666	

[FCC Home](#) | [Search](#) | [Updates](#) | [E-Filing](#) | [Initiatives](#) | [For Consumers](#) | [Find People](#)

Historical Collections System

Historical Collections System

[help](#)Logged In: tbutnam ([Log Out](#))[Update Password](#)

Historical Collections System - Washington Collections Data

[Return to Historical Collections Home](#) [Return to Washington Collections Search](#) [Return to Washington Collections Result](#)

☐ Washington Collections Applicant Data

FCN: 9810308210288001

Seq No	Applicant Name	Qty	Pmt Code	Pmt Amount	Trans Code	Call Sign	Fcc Code 1	Fcc Code 2
1	PANAMSAT LICENSEE CORPORATION	1	BNY	\$89,460.00	PMT			